990

Office of
Postsecondary
Education

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM Information and Application Procedures Fiscal Year 1990

Deadline: October 17, 1989

A Brief Introduction

The main activity of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) is conducting its Comprehensive Program. The Comprehensive Program is an annual grants competition with several notable characteristics:

- It is **comprehensive.** It supports a wide variety of improvement efforts throughout the whole range of postsecondary education.
- It is **action-oriented.** While the Comprehensive Program will entertain proposals to assess existing reforms or study the feasibility of reforms in the development stage, it ordinarily does not support basic research.
- It **takes risks.** Though the Comprehensive Program does sponsor the replication of proven ideas in new settings, its main objective is to foster new ways of achieving the goals of postsecondary education.
- It is **responsive.** Rather than requiring applicants to conform closely to specifications, **FIPSE** indicates general problems in its annual Agenda for Improvement (below) and invites applicants to address these problems imaginatively.

Over the past 17 years, the Comprehensive Program has invested $168 million in over 1,330 separate projects. Last year FIPSE received 1,891 preliminary proposals. Applicants can expect that the competition will continue to be stiff.

Projects

FIPSE typically provides support in the form of grants. Projects may receive support for 1-, 2-, or 3-year periods. Most funded projects are local improvements which continue beyond the period of Federal support; however, successful projects are generally designed to influence practice elsewhere. Projects can begin as early as August 1, 1990. It is estimated that 70 new awards will be made. Last year FIPSE made 76 new awards ranging from $15,000 to $165,000 per year. The average award was $68,000. These are only estimates and do not bind the Department of Education to a specific number of grants or to the amount of any grant unless that amount is otherwise specified by statute or regulations.

Eligibility

The involvement of many institutions, associations, organizations, and agencies is essential to the improvement of postsecondary education, and FIPSE supports the full range of providers of educational services. Proposals may be submitted by 2- and 4-year colleges and universities, both public and private, accredited and nonaccredited; community organizations, libraries and museums; non-profit trade and technical schools, unions, consortia, student groups, local government agencies, non-profit corporations, and associations. This list is not exhaustive. Proposals may be submitted by newly formed as well as established agencies.

READEX FICHE best copy available

ED 1.23/2:

FIPSE's Mandate

The Education Amendments Act of 1972 authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to improve postsecondary educational opportunities by providing assistance to educational institutions and agencies for a broad range of reforms and innovations. The specific authority is now contained in Title X of the Higher Education Act as amended in 1986. Regulations are contained in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 34 Part 630. In addition, the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR Parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, and 85 also apply.

To implement this authority, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare established the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, a separate organizational unit now within the Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education. FIPSE is administered by a Director and a small professional staff. The Director is advised by a 15-member National Board in establishing policy priorities and in reviewing grant proposals.

In the authorizing legislation, Congress identified eight broad purposes for which grants and contracts may be awarded. They are:

1) encouraging the reform, innovation, and improvement of postsecondary education and providing equal educational opportunity for all;
2) the creation of institutions and programs involving new paths to career and professional training and new combinations of academic and experiential learning;
3) the establishment of institutions and programs based on the technology of communications;
4) the carrying out in postsecondary educational institutions of changes in internal structure and operations designed to clarify institutional priorities and purposes;
5) the design and introduction of cost-effective methods of instructions and operation;
6) the introduction of institutional reforms designed to expand individual opportunities for entering and re-entering institutions and pursuing programs of study tailored to individual needs;
7) the introduction of reforms in graduate education, in the structure of academic professions, and in the recruitment and retention of faculties; and
8) the creation of new institutions and programs for examining and awarding credentials to individuals, and the introduction of reforms in current institutional practices related thereto.

FIPSE administers grant programs as its principal means to achieve these purposes, and occasional targeted programs are sponsored which focus on particular priorities or concerns.

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
7th & D Streets, S.W., Room 3100
Washington, D.C. 20202-5175
(202) 732-5750

I. Agenda for Improvement

In keeping with its Congressional mandate, FIPSE hereby invites proposals aimed at "encouraging the reform, innovation, and improvement of postsecondary education and providing equal educational opportunity for all." Improving the quality and accessibility of education beyond high school—*that* is FIPSE's broad mission and purpose. Our sense of what this mission entails as the nation heads into the last decade of the century will be evident from the following application guidelines. These guidelines highlight what seem to us particularly significant problems and opportunities in postsecondary education. We eagerly invite proposals to address these problems and opportunities in imaginative ways.

Our guidelines have been drawn from educators' suggestions, national reports, patterns of FIPSE applications in previous years, and other sources. However, we are under no misapprehension that they exhaust the significant challenges for postsecondary education today. We know that many of the best proposals in past years have dealt with issues not recognized up to that point in FIPSE's guidelines. Accordingly, this year, as in the past, **we welcome applications that go beyond our guidelines,** or that address more than one of our guidelines simultaneously; and naturally we encourage ideas that go beyond our examples of funded projects.

Curriculum Reform

FIPSE welcomes proposals that aim to ensure that undergraduate curricula provide the knowledge and skills needed by educated citizens.

The past five years have seen the growth of a national consensus about the importance of non-specialized liberal education within the undergraduate program. At the same time there has been widespread debate over just what knowledge this so-called "general education" should help students acquire. At this point, most colleges seem to have reached a local agreement on the proper content of general education—at least for the time being. The work that remains in many cases is to realize agreed-upon educational ideals. How does an institution that has committed itself to engaging students in a study of the perennial answers to the perennial questions make classic texts palatable or even comprehensible to underprepared freshmen? How does a faculty that has decided to restrict the pool of courses from which distribution requirements may be satisfied accredit some candidate courses as being broadly illuminating and not others, without raising questions of arbitrariness?

FIPSE is eager to support efforts to resolve these issues or to import approaches that have established track records to new types of campus settings.

Yet another priority that strikes observers of the recent debate over general education is to pay more attention to the "two cultures" problem: the relative ignorance, on the part of students oriented towards the humanities and social sciences, of the methods and the contents of the natural sciences and mathematics. Can general

education programs make "real science" and "real math" accessible and interesting to large numbers of students? Or must we settle, as some skeptics insist, for the diluted science and mathematics taught in the "science for poets" courses of undergraduate legend and the now-popular public policy courses on "science, technology, and society"?

Naturally, as general education reforms move to the implementation stage, discussion is shifting to other areas of the curriculum. One of these areas is the major, and with FIPSE support a number of task forces from the liberal arts and sciences disciplines are revisiting the question of what the major curricula ought to contain, and how they should relate to the rest of the undergraduate curriculum. This is being done under the auspices of the Association of American Colleges. Other disciplinary organizations and learned societies, as well as particular campus departments that wish to refine or redefine their major program, are welcome to apply for support. Applicants proposing to come forward with recommendations about the contents and skills to be mastered in a given major program should be prepared to make practical recommendations, also, about the ways such mastery should be demonstrated. Students deserve to know and faculty need to know whether the learning goals of their programs are being met.

Still largely unexamined, by contrast, is what one observer has termed "the other third" of the undergraduate curriculum—that which is neither required general education nor the major. A preliminary concern, shared by many, is that this "other third" is in danger of extinction, of falling prey to "over-majoring" as career-specific programs become more demanding of students' time. But the philosophical issue is how "the other third" can be put to the best educational use. There is widespread consensus that many students choose their free electives carelessly. Hence FIPSE welcomes proposals to promote thoughtful use of this "other third," whether these be proposals for special advising programs, or schemes whereby students "minor" in areas that complement their major, or requirements that they take clusters of courses with a common theme from different disciplines, or something else.

Another curricular issue evidently requiring more attention, despite recent efforts of individual institutions to render their own individual curricula more coherent, is what might be called inter-institutional curricular coherence. Given that a significant proportion of all bachelor's degree recipients start at two-year institutions, it is surely important to ask about the coherence of the curricular *experience* of students making this transfer. Does the course work in the latter undergraduate years build on knowledge and skills acquired in the first years? Are transfers missing out on significant parts of general education entirely? FIPSE welcomes action proposals that rest on answers to these questions. Where the paths from particular two-year colleges to particular four-year colleges are heavily traveled, there is plainly an opportunity to articulate programs and requirements.

Making Access Meaningful

FIPSE invites proposals to ensure that recent increases in access to postsecondary education are made more meaningful by improving retention rates without compromising standards. More involvement on the part of colleges themselves with the quality of student preparation for college is particularly encouraged.

Recent years have seen a great widening of access to postsecondary education. A larger proportion of the U.S. population than ever before and a larger proportion than in any other nation enjoys the advantages of education beyond high school. To be sure, barriers remain in the path of some students, and FIPSE will continue to help with the search for new ways around such barriers.

But the open door to postsecondary education too often proves to be a revolving door. Of the roughly 2.6 million students entering degree programs in higher education each year, for instance, over a million never receive a degree. The reasons for this regrettable situation are complex, but the fact that over half of the attrition occurs in the first semester of postsecondary study, together with the high correlation between attrition and high school grades, points to inadequate preparation as a central factor. What, then, can postsecondary institutions do—besides trying to compensate for preparation deficiencies within their own walls—*to improve the readiness for college of their future students?*

One obvious answer is to improve teacher education, and for this reason FIPSE will continue to lay its customary heavy stress in this area. (See the discussion below, pp. 7-8.) But there is an urgent need for other strategies as well. Seeing that high school learning is so seriously undermined by academic apathy, for instance,—with the typical student spending more time each week watching television than attending class and doing homework combined—colleges might well ask how they can provide incentives for harder study in high school through their own admissions, recruitment, and aid policies. Perhaps colleges could send clearer signals to high schoolers about the kind of preparation that is needed for success at the postsecondary level, and let high school principals know how their students fared after matriculation. Such information could flow naturally in the context of ongoing high school-college partnerships that also involve college counseling of seniors by college admissions personnel, academic program articulation, collegial relations between teachers at the two levels, and so forth.

The other significant boundary, besides that between high school and college, is the boundary between two-year schools, where a majority of freshmen now begin their higher education, and four-year schools. Can the early identification of promising candidates, better counseling, and better articulation between two- and four-year programs increase the number of students making this transition and persisting to a bachelor's degree? This is particularly important because of the relatively high proportion of minority students who begin their higher education in community colleges. More specifically,

the elusive goals of raising the number of minority school teachers might be advanced by focusing aggressively on the transition from two- to four-year institutions. In fact, FIPSE currently supports efforts at LaGuardia Community College in New York City, Portland State University, and Wayne Community College in Detroit directed at this goal, and we would welcome applications which extend these strategies in fresh and imaginative ways.

Creating a Learning-Friendly Campus Ethos

FIPSE welcomes proposals to make campus culture more conducive to academic commitment by all postsecondary students.

Levels of commitment to the academic task vary enormously from student to student. What can institutions do to make their culture or ethos conducive to serious study by all? A first step might be to ask whether anti-intellectual campus sub-cultures are not more powerful and pervasive than meets the administrative eye. How much do colleges and universities know, for instance, about the numbers of hours their students actually spend at their studies, or about the students' leisure time activities—and whether these activities complement, reinforce, or undermine academic commitment? Clear facts about these matters, though not always easy to establish, may well suggest closer attention to residence halls, athletic sub-cultures, fraternities and sororities, and drug and alcohol sub-cultures extending partly off-campus. For minority students, racial insensitivity or outright hostility may constitute a serious distraction from academic commitment. Hence, making the campus ethos conducive to learning for minority students may mean first making it simply comfortable. Similar points hold for women, older students—and the numerous foreign students on U.S. campuses, many of whom lead lonely existences and return home without an accurate view of our people.

Affecting the quality and seriousness of academic effort, as well as the amount, is a well-documented campus atmosphere of tolerance for derivative work, plagiarism, cheating, and other forms of academic dishonesty. As with drug abuse, institutions face a strong temptation to minimize the existence of the problem on their own campus, and forthright, courageous leadership will be needed. It may be that honor codes have a new relevance.

As regards commitment to academic pursuits, part-time and commuting students present a special challenge. Research has linked their frequently low motivation to their detachment from the informal intellectual life of the institution—snack-bar debates, guest lectures, campus theater, and the like. How can these part-time and commuting students be better integrated into the academic community?

International Education

FIPSE welcomes proposals for projects that would: clarify the ends and purposes of international education at particular institutions; create or renew courses or programs in international education; and assess the effectiveness of these courses or programs in meeting their objectives.

There is widespread interest in educating students about other countries and cultures. But many institutions need to deliberate further about the point or benefit of international education for their particular students. FIPSE wants to support such deliberations, believing them necessary for sensible program design. For instance, the goal of combatting student provincialism may well call for a different course of study than the goal of enlightening students about the interdependency of the world's economic powers. The aim of preparing students directly for participation in international commerce will presumably call for yet a third sort of "international education," and the preparation of specialists for strategic roles for yet a fourth. Would each purpose demand different sorts and degrees of training in foreign languages? Another key question would be that of how the basic academic disciplines, including history, can be utilized so that "international education" goes beyond the relatively ephemeral study of "current events."

Where an institution's purposes are already clear, FIPSE is eager to support and assess novel strategies for achieving them. For instance, there are now about 356,000 foreign students studying in American colleges and universities, over 140,000 of them in bachelor's degree programs. These students would seem to constitute a wonderful resource for helping their American peers understand the countries from which they hail. But the expectation that this would happen naturally, outside of class, does not seem to have been fulfilled; and in fact foreign students often complain about being ignored on our campuses. Hence the contact may need to become a formal part of academic programs. Similarly, the experiences of American students returning from study abroad would seem to be an underutilized educational resource for their American peers, as would the experiences of students who are immigrants to this country.

Combining Content Mastery with Pedagogical Expertise in the Education of School Teachers

FIPSE encourages proposals aimed at reforming the education of school teachers by: (i) increasing prospective teachers' mastery of the subjects they will teach; (ii) ensuring that prospective teachers have a solid grounding in the traditional arts and sciences; and (iii) broadening the customary preparation in pedagogy to include subject-specific pedagogy and attention to the cultural and learning-style differences in our increasingly diversified school population.

It is desirable that school teachers themselves be entrusted with the whole of the educational process--from the choice of texts and the construction of syllabi to the design of tests. Only this kind of autonomy will enable the teaching profession to attract the calibre and quantity of teachers the nation needs; and no less important, only autonomous teachers can model intellectual independence for their

students. But the public has rarely granted teachers much autonomy, being concerned that teachers' educational backgrounds have not equipped them to make maximal use of autonomy. FIPSE is eager to promote the sort of subject-matter mastery and educational breadth that will lead the public to entrust individual teachers with greater discretion and control.

What, then, can be done in the preservice training of teachers to insure a better balance between substantive education in the subject to be taught and professional preparation? What can be done to insure that the professional component and practice teaching do not squeeze back the general education of future teachers to a bare minimum? One widely-discussed approach is adding a "fifth year" to the postsecondary education of teachers. Can such programs attract meaningful numbers of students, given the extra cost and the current salary structure in the profession? If apprenticeship-like arrangements are introduced to help teacher trainees defray the cost of the extra year, can these students' on-the-job learning be monitored adequately?

But content mastery is plainly useless to a teacher unless he or she can *teach*, and hence most students preparing for teaching careers will continue to study pedagogy and other professional subjects. Fresh ideas on these subjects need to be nurtured to the point where they can be evaluated in action, including the idea that good pedagogical technique varies with the subject to be taught. Further, teachers must be equipped by their professional training to deal with classes that are ever more culturally diverse, and to accommodate the individual differences in learning styles that have been revealed by research. Moreover, there is a special need to prepare and motivate people for service in schools and settings with high proportions of "at-risk" students.

Finally, FIPSE is interested in improvements in the methods used to assess and certify instructional competence.

Faculty Development

FIPSE solicits proposals that seek to develop faculty as teachers by: (i) recognizing and rewarding effective teaching through appointment, promotion, and compensation policies; (ii) disseminating proven but underappreciated pedagogies; (iii) providing new opportunities for faculty to stay current with scholarship in the broad range of areas they typically teach; and (iv) facilitating the best possible match between faculty members and institutions.

(i) Postsecondary educators agree on the importance of good teaching. But this consensus is not always translated into policies that encourage faculty to put their energies into such teaching. And even when the official policies of an institution's central administration do stress teaching effectiveness, the department chairs who have practical discretion over incentives may operate under pressure to give much more than the 'official' weight to faculty research activity. One constraint is that departments hoping to recruit excellent young instructors may have little choice but to promise candidates

considerable opportunity and support for research and scholarship. Also, department procedures for evaluating faculty have tended to focus more on scholarly activity than on teaching because the procedures for evaluating scholarship have seemed less disputable.

What institutional or departmental initiatives might improve the situation? One initiative that is underway is at Benedict College in South Carolina. Benedict is getting support from FIPSE to provide teaching workshops for faculty and, at the same time, to formulate, implement, and assess a system for evaluating effective teaching. Benedict intends to have teaching become the primary basis for granting promotion, merit pay, and tenure. Another interesting project is being undertaken with FIPSE help by Rhode Island College. Several of its academic departments are developing tailored approaches to teaching improvement—with the quality of the teaching being measured by student learning outcomes rather than by enrollment numbers, student questionnaire results, or the other conventional indices. A task force of faculty and administrators is allocating rewards to the departments on the basis of documented improvements in student learning outcomes. Curiously, few colleges seem to have considered a compromise approach whereby individual faculty would be able to choose, from year to year, whether to be evaluated on their teaching or on a combination of teaching and scholarship. This might help colleges deal simultaneously with the need to recruit and support younger, research-oriented faculty and the need to maintain the dedication and self-esteem of older, teaching-oriented faculty.

(ii) Faculty learn about developments in their fields from professional journals and conferences that are dominated almost wholly by concern with research and scholarship. Proven innovations in the pedagogies of the various disciplines are not disseminated systematically, except through a few journals. FIPSE welcomes proposals to disseminate proven but underappreciated pedagogical strategies. Experience suggests that funding for this accomplishes more when it supports the disseminator directly, rather than the recipients, but all models will be entertained.

(iii) Faculty, including faculty at community colleges, often lack opportunities to stay current with substantive developments in the broad range of areas they typically teach. Existing resources for keeping current—summer seminars and the like—normally focus on specialties *within* the disciplines. To support faculty in their teaching mission there must be updating strategies that give faculty a sense of developments on a broader front. For instance, a grant to George Mason University is helping provide graduate courses for community college faculty to acquaint them with the most recent developments across the wide frontiers of their disciplines.

(iv) The obvious diversity of postsecondary institutions makes it important to focus on the match or fit between individual students and the schools they attend, and this issue has in fact had a great deal of attention. But more must be done to facilitate the proper matching

of institutions and individual *faculty*, particularly in view of the evolution of interests over the course of an academic career and the slower but real evolution of institutions. Proper matching and re-matching means that faculty must have mobility. But tenure, for all its virtues, makes mid-career faculty less mobile, *de facto*, than business people and other professionals. The risks for individual faculty of relinquishing tenure at one institution without a guarantee of tenure at the next are a great deterrent, as are the risks for institutions of promising tenure to new faculty without a probationary period. What can be done to increase faculty mobility without compromising faculty security? Could new types of creative exchanges or quasi-sabbaticals help? Research-oriented institutions have been relatively willing to bring in new faculty at mid-career because they can gauge what matters to them by looking at a candidate's publications. Would the relative unwillingness of teaching-oriented institutions to bring in mid-career faculty be reduced by the development of more reliable indices of teaching effectiveness (a desirable thing for other reasons as well, of course)?

Graduate and Professional Education

FIPSE invites proposals which seek to reform graduate education by: (i) improving the preparation for teaching of Ph.D. candidates bound for college teaching careers; and (ii) broadening the social and ethical perspectives of students in graduate and professional programs generally.

(i) Graduate study in research universities fails to prepare graduate students adequately for many aspects of their first teaching positions. The undergraduates they encounter may have varying academic preparations, and they may not share their teachers' sense of what makes academic study valuable. How can doctoral candidates be readied to turn their scholarly intelligence to the task of engaging college undergraduates in active study?

One response to these problems is a FIPSE-supported project at the University of Chicago, which provides its doctoral candidates with a sequence of practical teaching experiences—first with Chicago undergraduates and then at one of 35 midwestern liberal arts colleges. The graduate students combine teaching with participation in colloquia on the problems of presenting their disciplines to students and in workshops on syllabus design conducted by senior Chicago faculty.

(ii) Graduate training for the professions confronts a dilemma. Its main objective is preparing students for specialized functions, and hence the training itself tends to be specialized. Yet many of these students also go on to assume positions of great and general responsibility, and it is therefore important to society that they develop social vision and moral understanding. Graduate training, including preparation of people for academic careers, should do much more to help in this direction. One effort receiving FIPSE support is that of St. Cloud State University in Minnesota, which will integrate the consideration of ethical issues into all of its graduate programs; as part of the project,

graduate students from the professional disciplines will participate in a university-wide seminar on ethics.

Assessing for Improvement

FIPSE welcomes proposals that aim to improve the quality of undergraduate and graduate education by developing means of assessing student learning and strategies for tying the results of assessment to improvements in the educational process.

Since this guideline appeared in FIPSE's application materials three years ago, assessment has become the most significant new development in U.S. postsecondary education—with 15 states now mandating assessment and many more contemplating doing so, and with assessment initiatives underway at two-thirds of public institutions and two-fifths of independent ones. The fear, or in some quarters, the hope, that assessment would prove to be a passing fad is not being confirmed. FIPSE has been an important supporter of assessment through a number of grants to individual institutions, consortia, and national associations, including the American Association for Higher Education, which had more than 1100 faculty and administrators at its 1989 assessment conference.

There are several goals confronting the assessment movement today. First is the continuing need to acquaint newly interested schools, state systems, and accreditors with the best of current practice—to get novices off on the right foot. Second would be to ensure that assessment practice develops in directions that enhance its credibility and appeal among teaching faculty themselves, lest it come to be seen as a routine, educationally useless reporting chore. This will require the strengthening of connections between assessment itself and concrete improvements in teaching and learning. Models need to be developed, not just for the collection of data on student learning, but for the use of these data by faculty and administrators; and these experimental models for utilizing data to improve educational practices must *themselves* be subjected to evaluation in terms of their impact on student learning. Third, assessment planning must be linked to the discussion of curriculum. By bringing these two conversations together, both can be improved. The "assessibility" of curricular goals is a natural criterion for their definiteness and clarity. Conversely, assessment methods and instruments must capture the real goals of the curriculum if those methods and instruments are to be considered valid.

Financing and Educational Reform

FIPSE welcomes proposals to make the financial practices of postsecondary institutions as conducive as possible to the achievement of the educational objectives of students, institutions themselves, and the nation. This includes proposals that seek to moderate increases in tuition and proposals to revise pricing and aid policies in the light of educational priorities.

There is widespread consensus that rising college costs threaten to distort individuals' choices of whether and where to go to college, what to study, and whether to persist—all choices with long-run

implications for the nation's hope of mass education and for the productivity of the labor force. Can fresh thinking help colleges respond?

In one intriguing experiment, a consortium of 12 colleges is looking at the possibility of containing costs by charging students a user fee for peripheral services that have traditionally been "bundled" together with instructional charges. Besides providing lower-income students access to a "no-frills model," the strategy promises to hold down overall budgets by giving all students an incentive to use only services they truly need and find worthwhile. Similarly, basing charges to students on the real costs of the specific *academic* services they use could promote the pro-liberal arts educational philosophy of many institutions—while serving the goals of access and cost-containment—insofar as many liberal arts programs are less expensive to offer than many preprofessional ones.

Along the same lines, charging lower-division students less, in accordance with the lower cost of teaching them, might help with retention, since these students are the likeliest to leave college for financial reasons. None of this is to suggest, of course, that cross-subsidies are always undesirable: few schools would risk discouraging students from seeking alcohol counseling services by charging a user fee, and few would jeopardize foreign language enrollments by charging more for these courses simply because they are expensive to teach. Indeed the very debate about which cross-subsidies are desirable may be valuable as a way of making institutional priorities explicit. In sum, FIPSE will be interested in college financing proposals that serve the educational goals of increasing access, cost-containment, improving retention, and rectifying the balance between preprofessional and liberal arts enrollments.

Education for a Changing Economy

FIPSE invites proposals that seek to make postsecondary education responsive to changes in the nation's economy.

The growth of global competition and the expansion of an information and technology intensive economy in this country have strengthened the potential contribution of postsecondary education to economic prosperity.

FIPSE encourages proposals to improve both the content and quality of education intended to prepare individuals to be effective in their chosen occupations. In an era of global competition, for example, the development of foreign language competencies and an understanding of other cultures are becoming significant dimensions of professional competence. Clemson University, the College of Staten Island, the University of Rhode Island, and the Colorado School of Mines have received support to blend traditional language and culture studies with international internships and professional study in fields such as business, international trade, and engineering.

The expansion of an information-based economy and rapid technological change also means that competent professionals must possess knowledge and skills that go beyond the specialized expertise of their fields. To be effective decision makers and managers they must have a broad understanding of the context in which they operate, and they must be able to bridge the gap between formal academic training and the complex and ambiguous reality of practice. This knowledge and skill is traditionally associated with the goals of a liberal education, and applicants are encouraged to develop proposals in which significant liberal study is closely related to specialized training and becomes an integral part of professional competence.

Colleges and universities have an important role to play in new partnerships for technology and information transfer. A steady and effective flow of new knowledge and technology into the economy is essential if we are to maintain competitiveness in a global economy. This applies to our older manufacturing industries as well as to the growing service, information and technology-intensive sectors of the economy. FIPSE encourages proposals for educational programs that go beyond the short-term employer-based training that is associated with industry-specific innovations, new products and production methods, or changing policies and regulations. These new educational programs should provide practicing professionals with an opportunity to work with colleges and universities on the fundamental knowledge required for competent practice over the long term. Such extensions of college and university resources may be most successful when they support two-way transfers in which the effectiveness of the college or university is enhanced through active work with the demanding reality of practice.

At the other end of the spectrum, about 20 million 16-24 year olds are not likely to undertake a college education, and a significant proportion of this "forgotten half" of America's youth will drop out of high school. This population faces significant obstacles to securing a good living, and our economy cannot afford to lose such a significant portion of its workforce. FIPSE encourages the active involvement of postsecondary education in addressing the needs of this group. As was implied in the earlier section on access, there may be a significant role for colleges and universities to play in forming partnerships with elementary and secondary school systems to reduce school drop-out rates and improve students' ability to benefit from education and training beyond the secondary level.

Uses and Implications of the New Technologies

FIPSE invites proposals to develop innovative educational applications for new and newly-available electronic technologies.

Since educational technology proposals began to be specifically solicited by FIPSE in 1980, the hardware has become much cheaper and much more common on college campuses, and thousands of proposals involving technology have been received. These have rarely proposed technological innovation *per se*. Rather they have sought to apply existing electronic technologies to familiar educational

objectives such as the improvement of instruction, the broadening of access, or the assessment of student learning. Hence the benefit of this technology for postsecondary education is proving to be a many-sided question, which FIPSE wants to help educators explore, without any expectation of a single or simple answer.

A main focus for FIPSE will continue to be the development of software for teaching. Particularly appealing, given our interest in improvements that can be disseminated to new settings, is software (plus supporting materials) that can be plugged into various courses and disciplines—for instance, a statistics teaching package being developed at Tufts for use in biology, mathematics, and other disciplines. Please note that, courseware development having become routine for many faculty, applicants will need to show that their proposed project would take them beyond their ordinary resources and responsibilities. In disciplines where computers are an important tool of working professionals—such as economics and physics—the educational applications of technology may consist of involving undergraduates in simulated versions of professional practice, as at Denison University, where computer laboratories are being used throughout the economics program.

The rapid burgeoning of educational technology makes the question of its real impact—or impacts—a very pressing one. What approaches best qualify for dissemination? How should individual campuses allocate resources between different applications of technology—and between technology and other priorities? Hence FIPSE will continue to stress the "evaluation component" of the technology projects it funds. And we encourage proposals specifically to evaluate particular but generalizable applications of educational technology. Applicants are encouraged to consult the report of the FIPSE Technology Study Group for a detailed consideration of the philosophical issues surrounding technology assessment.

* * *

FIPSE has always welcomed proposals to disseminate its own successful projects. FIPSE is also prepared to entertain dissemination proposals for projects originally developed under other sponsorship **if there is clear and solid evidence that these projects have been effective at the original site, and that they have a potential for impact on a problem of national significance.** Applicants should make a case that FIPSE support will help the spread of the reform in question to become a self-sustaining process.

II. Guide to Proposal Development

The purpose of this section is to explain FIPSE's review process, its criteria for selecting proposals, and the kinds of questions raised during the review process. We recognize that not all of the considerations raised here will pertain to your particular proposal, and we discourage you from trying to organize your proposal around direct responses to all of them. Instead, we hope that this discussion will help you to conceive and write a stronger proposal by alerting you to the ways in which it will be read and judged.[1]

The Review Process

The Comprehensive Program uses a two-stage review process in order to evaluate efficiently a broad range of proposal ideas. In the first stage, applicants submit a five-page summary (double-spaced) of their proposal. You may submit more than one proposal; the quality of each will be assessed independently.

Because of FIPSE's broad eligibility requirements and the breadth of its programmatic interests, we receive as many as 2,000 preliminary proposals each year. The applicants whose preliminary proposals are most promising are invited to submit full-scale proposals, and from these about 70 are selected for new grants. Although competition for funding is very stiff, it should be noted that almost half of our current project directors have never before directed a Federal grant, and only one in ten has previously been a FIPSE project director.

The examination of **preliminary proposals** begins with an assessment by external reviewers, not members of the FIPSE staff. The staff and Director then consider these reviews as they analyze and choose proposals to be invited back. The readers of your proposal may be faculty, administrators, students, researchers, business people, government workers or journalists. A new group is selected each year.

Our readers are chosen for their grasp of a broad range of issues in postsecondary education. Although an effort is made to match each preliminary proposal with at least one reader who is specially knowledgeable in the proposal area, some readers are bound to know less about your particular need, approach, and setting. So you must not presuppose such knowledge in your application. It is particularly important to **avoid jargon and technical language.** Similarly, please stick to concrete language. Terms like "model," "system," "process," "workshop," "module," and "instructional materials" are vague and general. Readers often see them as as sign that the applicant has not decided just what he or she wants to do. Be aware too that readers are asked to review almost 50 proposals in 3 days so that they can gain perspective on relative significance. **It is, therefore, imperative that your preliminary proposal be limited to five double-spaced pages.**

At the preliminary stage especially, FIPSE's focus is on the relative significance of proposals, as defined under "Selection Criteria" (below). This means that the applicant should be sure to discuss: the problem

[1]The program information is intended to aid applicants in applying for assistance under this competition. Nothing in the program information package is intended to impose any paperwork, application content, reporting, or grantee performance requirement beyond those specifically imposed under the statute and regulations governing the competition.

being addressed, in the local as well as national context; what the applicant proposes to do about the problem; and how, if the proposed activities are local, these activities might have benefits on a wider scale. Note too that "significance" is understood to imply improving on existing practice, though FIPSE does on occasion support projects designed to disseminate practices that have already proven successful.

In the past too many applicants have failed to show a thorough knowledge of how others are responding elsewhere to similar problems, and hence have failed to show that their proposal would constitute an improvement on existing practice. Applicants should survey existing approaches and briefly characterize them in their preliminary proposals. At the full proposal stage, these surveys of existing practices should be conveyed in more detail. (FIPSE program officers can often suggest people to contact as you make your survey.)

If you are invited to submit a final proposal, we will talk with you by telephone about the criticisms, questions, and comments by external readers and staff.

While the review of preliminary proposals is primarily on issues of significance, the review of **final proposals** shifts to include equal emphasis on feasibility, and can include the full range of issues raised in this section. Nevertheless, a final proposal should still be concise, both in the proposal narrative and in supporting documentation. **The narrative section of a full proposal should be limited to approximately 15 to 25 double-spaced pages.**

Usually the external reviewers will include both generalist and expert perspectives on your project. Final proposals may also be reviewed by additional experts when technical questions arise, and by FIPSE's National Board, which plays an active role in the latter stages.

After thorough review of final proposals, FIPSE staff typically telephone the more competitive applicants in order to verify or clarify information about the project and its situation. We may also contact others who are in a position to know your work and plans, or who would be affected by the project. This critical stage of review leads to much useful information for our final round of decisions. Such investigation will begin sometime in May, but the decision process will continue through the end of July.

Selection Criteria

Our intent in this and the following section is to help applicants understand how the selection criteria are applied to proposals during the review process.

Throughout the review process, field readers and staff must make overall judgments about the extent to which a project will contribute to the improvement of postsecondary education, as well as more particular judgments about a proposal's separate components. We deliberately choose not to rigidly separate proposals into types of activities, sectors of postsecondary education, or other fixed categories.

And we do not assign specific amounts of our budget to the problem areas described in Section I. Instead, every proposal is compared to all others, in an attempt to find the most significant issues and feasible plans.

In order to make these overall judgments, FIPSE uses three general sets of criteria to judge all proposals' significance, feasibility, and appropriateness for FIPSE support.

Significance in improving postsecondary education is estimated by determining the extent to which the project would: (1) address an important problem or need; (2) represent an improvement upon, or important departure from, existing practice; (3) involve learner-centered improvements; (4) achieve far-reaching impact through improvements that will be useful in a variety of ways and in a variety of settings; and (5) increase the cost-effectiveness of services.

Feasibility is estimated by determining the extent to which: (1) the project represents an appropriate response to the problem or need addressed; (2) the applicant is capable of carrying out the project, as evidenced by, for example, (i) the applicant's understanding of the problem or need, (ii) the quality of the project design, including objectives, approaches, and evaluation plan, (iii) the adequacy of resources, including money, personnel, facilities, equipment, and supplies, (iv) the qualifications of key personnel who would conduct the project, and (v) the relevance of the applicant's prior experience; (3) the applicant and any other participating organizations are committed to the success of the proposed project, as evidenced by, for example, (i) contribution of resources by the applicant and by participating organizations, (ii) prior work in the area, and (iii) potential for continuation of the project beyond the period of FIPSE support (unless the project is self-terminating), and (4) the proposed project demonstrates potential for dissemination to or adaptation by other organizations, and shows evidence of interest by potential users.

The Director and staff also review each proposal to determine whether support of the project by FIPSE is **appropriate** in terms of the availability of other funding sources for the proposed activities.

For preliminary proposals, the selection criteria under "significance" are more important than those under "feasibility" and "appropriateness," which are equally important. For final proposals, all criteria are equally important. The final judgment of an application is based on an overall assessment of the extent to which the application satisfactorily addresses the selection criteria.

Questions and Concerns

As a further guide for preparing a proposal, we outline below a series of questions and concerns which reflect these criteria. Again, not all of these considerations would apply to any particular proposal, and preliminary proposals can only make essential points. But information which responds to questions like these should form the substance of your proposal.

Importance of the problem or need. Your proposal should describe the problem you wish to address both in its local setting and in the national context. Section I of this Program Announcement identifies some problem areas, but you are not required to propose a project addressing these problem areas.

With regard to the particular mission of your own institution or agency, how central is the problem you have identified to the vitality of your institution or the effectiveness of your educational service? What will be the likely consequences if no action is taken? What is the special impetus for seeking the improvements now? Have you made any efforts to achieve these purposes in the past? If so, what were they and what were the results?

With regard to the national context, does the problem you are addressing affect other institutions or organizations around the country? If your response to the problem is successful, are these other institutions and organizations likely to benefit or learn from your experience in ways that would enable them to improve their own programs and services?

As we try to assess the relative importance of the need you have identified both locally and in larger contexts, any supporting evidence you might provide will be extremely helpful. For example, if your effort is similar to or makes use of prior efforts elsewhere, can you provide strong evidence or argument about the success of those efforts? If you propose to improve on a previous effort, can you provide evidence about why that effort did not do better? If you believe others might benefit from your project, can you identify them, and can you describe how your project would contribute to their improvement efforts?

In addition to identifying a particular problem or need, you should also demonstrate your understanding of its causes. The improvement proposed in your project should be designed to respond to the variables and factors that contribute to the problem or need you have identified.

Learner-centeredness. The basic purpose of FIPSE is to improve education and educational opportunities for learners, directly or indirectly. Whether the project is instructional or institutional, reviewers should be convinced that real benefits to learners can be expected. Learner-centeredness also means that FIPSE values proposals that recognize and convey to the reader the centrality of the learner in the educational process and system. It follows that FIPSE will particularly welcome proposals whose design is directly shaped by input from working teachers, those closest to the learner, closest to the realities of the classroom. This applies especially to proposals in teacher education and faculty development.

Far-reaching impact. FIPSE can support only a limited number of new projects each year, yet these must potentially benefit the nation's postsecondary learners. FIPSE encourages projects whose success (or

failure) will be influential in a variety of ways and in a variety of settings.

Cost-effectiveness. FIPSE encourages more educational value for the dollar. Also, FIPSE is interested in projects whose dollar levels and long-range budget plans provide for realistic continuation by the host institution and adaptation by other institutions.

Clarity and evaluation of intended outcomes. You need to state your objectives clearly. Just what changes are you trying to bring about, and what groups or individuals are being targeted? Of course there may be several outcomes—some immediate, others more long-range. But it should be possible to identify in your proposal both the immediate and long-range outcomes and their relationship to the problem or need you have determined. If the direct outcome is not a benefit to learners, then you should show how the immediate outcome will have an ultimate impact on learners.

In the final proposal, we ask for a section on evaluation. What, in your view, would count as evidence that your project had succeeded? What would count as evidence that it had failed? It may be difficult, within the terms of the grant, to assess accomplishment of long-range objectives, but you should be able to identify or develop some proximate indicators. Bear in mind that the goals of local institutionalization and wider impact may well elude you unless you can provide others with solid evidence that your project achieved its aims. **Developing such evidence should not be put off until the last stages of a project. It must be a consideration from the design stage onward.**

Plainly, of course, FIPSE-supported projects are not tightly controlled scientific experiments expected to yield conclusive results. Nonetheless, even tentative conclusions may serve as the basis for design of more rigorous efforts to enhance your own operation. Indeed, part of guiding a developing project involves getting information about how well (or badly) things are going. This kind of evaluation (formative as opposed to summative) can be critical for correcting problems before they overwhelm the project.

Prospects for wider impact. Will your project be useful beyond the time and place of the FIPSE grant? In most cases where a program or service is being developed, you should discuss the likelihood that the activity will be continued after the grant is completed. FIPSE has had unusual success with the institutionalization of its projects, and we consider that this is an important extension of institutional commitment.

Your specific problem diagnosis and statement of immediate objectives provide a basis for judging the effect of the project on your own institution or agency. But FIPSE also attempts to assess how others may benefit from your undertaking. Do the activities you propose represent a significant departure from, or improvement upon, existing practice? Are there features of your project which, if successful, are replicable or applicable elsewhere?

Evaluation can be an important tool for increasing a project's wider use. In designing a good evaluation plan, it might help if you imagine that some other institution was submitting your proposal: what would you need to learn about their project in order for your institution to benefit concretely from its results? What form should the information take in order to be sufficiently noticeable, credible, and useful? Such evaluations typically use a combination of statistical measurement and non-quantitative evidence.

Some projects are themselves efforts to disseminate or adapt proven approaches. There are many ways of informing others of project results, and of helping others make use of our experience. In reviewing plans for dissemination or adaptation, we ask whether the method is appropriate for the practice in question and whether it improves upon methods used elsewhere.

Will other institutions be able to benefit from your project without their own grants from FIPSE? Because issues of cost are often critical for adaptation and institutionalization, **proposals requiring grant dollars for student stipends or equipment are rarely competitive.** Instead we expect that projects requiring such funds will acquire the money from other sources. Grants cannot be used for the purchase of real property or for construction.

Feasibility and appropriateness of the project activities. Your proposal should describe how you will bring about the outcomes you desire. It is surprising how often we must search to determine exactly how an applicant will use the requested support. Indeed, in some proposals the activities to be undertaken become clear only by reading the budget, and then relating the budget back to the narrative. What specific actions will be made possible by the grant? How are these actions responsive to the problem or need you have identified? What chain of events leads from these actions to the ultimate outcomes and benefits of the project? In a preliminary proposal you will not be able to provide details, but you should clearly communicate the key features of the approach you are taking to accomplish your objectives.

We are interested not only in understanding your proposed approach, but also in knowing why you selected it to accomplish your objectives. What other strategies have been or could be used, and how do they compare?

Have you tried this on a more modest scale, or do you know of experimentation with it? Or do you have reason to believe that it would work regardless of the fact that it has never been tried? Perhaps it has been tried elsewhere and failed, but you could cite particular modifications in your approach which would lead to different results. If prior experiments did not work, how will you avoid similar problems?

Finally, it is important to document that significant numbers of people actually want the service and will be able to use it.

Capacity and commitment of the applicant. Your proposal should expand upon your earlier description of how you intend to bring about the outcomes you desire. What is needed here, for adequate judgment, is a plan complete with settings, actors, events, and calendars for your planned activity. We recognize that there are many uncertainties underlying any design. Do you have a contingency plan? What kinds of internal evaluation would help you discover, in time, that unexpected problems or opportunities have appeared? FIPSE recognizes that the plan you propose may have to be changed, but we need information about specific actions, agents, budgets, and timetables in order to assess your capacity to perform the project. We will be asking whether the project is realistic in terms of the people and funds allocated to the task. What are the capabilities of the project director and staff? Is the ratio of cost to benefit such that this activity, if successful, would encourage reallocation or greater allocation of resources?

Your proposal should provide evidence of commitment to the proposed project. Has your institution a track record of success in this type of activity? Has your institution or agency allocated any of its own resources to the project? Does the success of the project depend on agencies or institutions in addition to the applicant? If so, have they been contacted, and what is their view of the proposed action? Have their staff and students who will implement the project been involved in the planning?

Are there plans for eventual self-support built into the project? Are there external pressures or incentives that will reinforce the commitment to the project once it is underway, or which will help resolve the conflicts which often arise in improvement efforts?

Applicants planning to institutionalize a program usually assume an increasing share of the costs during the grant. There is no set formula for cost sharing, but FIPSE staff and readers will judge whether the institution is bearing a reasonable share of the direct and indirect costs, particularly when the major benefits are local. **A key indication of commitment to a project is the degree to which the sponsoring institution or agency shares in its direct and indirect costs.**

Finally, FIPSE is interested in cooperating with other funding agencies when this will increase the impact of a grant without duplicating support. Applicants should indicate if they are also seeking support from other sources. Also, applicants should indicate why support from FIPSE is in fact appropriate, if other sources (local or national) seem obvious.

A final note. We do not review draft proposals, but we are happy to discuss your ideas and to discuss typical questions and concerns of reviewers. See page 2 for our phone number.

III. Submission Procedures and Closing Dates

Submission procedures are similar to those used by FIPSE for the past several years. The Comprehensive Program has a two-stage submission and review process. To qualify for funding consideration, all applicants must submit a preliminary proposal on or before Tuesday, October 17, 1989.

FIPSE will review these preliminary proposals and by Friday, January 26, 1990, will mail notifications to applicants invited to submit final proposals. Final proposals must be submitted on or before Friday, March 2, 1990.

The announced closing dates and procedures for guaranteeing timely submission will be strictly observed.

Applicants should also note that the closing date applies to both the date the application is mailed and the hand delivery date. A mailed application meets the requirement if it is mailed on or before the pertinent closing date and the required proof of mailing is provided. Proof of mailing may consist of one of the following: (a) a legibly dated U.S. Postal Service postmark; (b) a legible receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service; (c) a dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier; or (d) any other proof of mailing acceptable to the Secretary of Education.

If an application is sent through the U.S. Postal Service, the Secretary will not accept either of the following as proof of mailing: (1) a private metered postmark, or (2) a mail receipt that is not dated by the U.S. Postal Service. Please use first class mail. All applicants will receive acknowledgment notices upon receipt of preliminary and final proposals. If you do not receive an acknowledgment notice within six weeks of the closing date, please contact FIPSE using the address or phone number on page 2 of these guidelines. Please wait for the full six weeks after the closing date before contacting us for an acknowledgment.

MAILING ADDRESS

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM
ATTN: 84.116A
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APPLICATION CONTROL CENTER
ROOM 3633
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202-4725

Submission Procedures for Preliminary Proposals

Preliminary Proposals Sent by Mail: Proposals sent by mail must be mailed not later than October 17, 1989. First class mail should be used. See above address.

Hand Delivered Preliminary Proposals: Hand delivered proposals will be accepted daily between the hours of 8:00 a.m., and 4:30 p.m., Washington, D.C. time except Saturdays, Sundays, or Federal holidays,

at the Application Control Center, General Services Administration Building, 7th & D Streets, S.W., Room 3633, Washington, D.C. Proposals will not be accepted after 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 17, 1989.

Number of Copies of Preliminary Proposals: All applicants must submit **ONE (1) SIGNED ORIGINAL AND TWO (2) COPIES OF PROPOSALS.** Each proposal copy must be covered with a Title Page, Form ED0001 (attached) or a reasonable facsimile. Applicants are also requested to submit three (3) additional copies of the Title Page itself.

Preliminary Proposal Content

All applicants are urged to develop proposals which are concise and clearly written. Each preliminary proposal should include the following components:

- **Title Page:** Use Form ED0001 (attached) or a suitable facsimile to cover each proposal copy. For the preliminary proposal, applicants need not complete items 1 and 2. These data are necessary at the final proposal stage only. See the back of the Title Page for additional instructions. Be sure your abstract is clear and concrete. It is used at several points in the review as a summary of your project.
- **Narrative:** This section should be **double-spaced** and no more than 5 pages in length. There is no standard outline. Plainly, curriculum development proposals, for instance, will utilize a somewhat different format from access proposals. But for many kinds of proposals something like the following will be serviceable:
  - Describe the problem or need being addressed; note that unless the problem is little understood or unique to your setting, this section may be quite brief.
  - State what you propose to do about this problem or need.
  - Explain how your strategy would improve upon those being tried elsewhere.
  - Specify the objective(s) of the project.
- **Background Information:** It is occasionally essential to include a small amount (e.g. 1-2 pages) of background material about the institution, problem or strategy as an appendix. Resumes are not needed at this stage.
- **Budget:** No detailed breakdowns are required. However, preliminary proposals should include the estimated amounts of major anticipated expenditures as indicated on the attached Budget Page. To be sure that you are submitting a complete application package, we urge you to use the checklist at the end of this publication.
- **Receipt of Application Card:** Detach and complete the postcard on the back page of this booklet. Attach it to the original proposal. This card will be returned to you to acknowledge receipt of your proposal. If your card does not arrive within six weeks, please notify FIPSE.

Submission Procedures for Final Proposals

Final Proposals Sent by Mail: Proposals sent by mail must be mailed not later than Friday, March 2, 1990.

Hand Delivered Final Proposals: Hand delivered proposals will be accepted daily between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Washington, D.C. time except Saturdays, Sundays, or Federal holidays, at the Application Control Center, 7th & D Streets, S.W., Room 3633, General Services Administration Building, Washington, D.C. Proposals will not be accepted after 4:30 p.m. on Friday, March 2, 1990.

Number of Copies of Final Proposals: All applicants must submit **ONE (1) SIGNED ORIGINAL AND TWO (2) COPIES OF PROPOSALS.** Each proposal copy must be covered with a Title Page, Form ED0001 (attached) or a reasonable facsimile. Applicants are also requested to submit three (3) additional copies of the Title Page itself.

Final Proposal Content

All applicants are urged to develop proposals which are concise and clearly written. Listed below are requested components for final proposals.

- **Title Page:** Use Form ED0001 (attached) or a suitable facsimile to cover each proposal copy. Additional instructions are printed on the reverse side of the Title Page. Please include a brief abstract in the space provided, in addition to the requirement which follows:
- **Abstract:** Attach a one-page, **double-spaced** abstract following the Title Page. This is a key element in all proposals, and should include statements about: (1) the problem being addressed; (2) the proposed activities; and (3) the project's intended outcomes.
- **Narrative:** While there is no standard outline, final proposals should provide, in approximately fifteen (15) to twenty-five (25) **double-spaced** pages, at least five kinds of information. Applicants should review Section II, Guide to Proposal Development, for further discussion of FIPSE's review criteria and these chief considerations:
  - —Problem identification. FIPSE needs to judge the importance of the problem or need being addressed in a final proposal. This discussion should include, if appropriate, (a) a description of the problem in its local context and in terms of broader contexts, (b) supporting empirical evidence, and (c) a discussion of past attempts to deal with the problem by the applicant or by others.
  - —Description of proposed project. FIPSE needs to judge the feasibility and appropriateness of project activities. This discussion should include (a) the project's approach, including specific plans and timetables, (b) the agents who will implement the project, and (c) indication that groups and individuals affected by the project have been contacted.
  - —Statement of objectives. FIPSE needs to judge the clarity of program objectives and evaluation plans. This discussion should include short-term and long-term outcomes expected from the

project, both those which are measurable within the project's evaluation and those which might be achieved beyond the life of the project.

— Discussion of the applicant's capacity and commitment. FIPSE needs to judge the feasibility of the project in terms of the capabilities and background of the project staff, so brief resumes should be included in the final proposal. It is also important to discuss the record of the institution or agency in this area or in similar fields, and the extent of support for the project from the sponsoring agency (including budgetary support through cost-sharing) and other affected groups.

— Discussion of plans for wider impact. FIPSE needs to judge, inasmuch as it is appropriate for the project in question, prospects that the project will be continued after funding, and the extent to which the project will be of benefit to others than those immediately served.

- **Institutional and Personnel Information:** Applicants may at their discretion submit an appendix to the proposal containing background information on their institutions or agencies which is relevant to a full understanding of the significance and feasibility of the proposed project. For key project staff please attach descriptions of relevant capabilities and experience.

- **Budget:** Use the attached form or a suitable facsimile to prepare a complete, standard budget including details of expenditures for salary, travel, etc.

  Also, provide a narrative budget statement explaining: (1) the basis used to estimate certain costs (professional personnel, consultants, travel, indirect costs), and any other costs that may appear unusual; (2) how the major cost items relate to the proposed project activities; and (3) the costs of the project's evaluation component.

THE COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM
FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Form No.: ED0001
OMB No.: 1840-0514
Form Exp.: 10/31/89

Preliminary _____ Final _____

This application should be sent to:
No. 84.116A
U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Room 3633
Washington, D.C. 20202-4725

1. Application No.

2. Employer Identification No.

3. Project Director
(Name and Complete Mailing Address)

Telephone: _____ _____
Area Code and Number

4. Institutional Information
Highest Degree Level
_____ Two Year
_____ Four Year
_____ Graduate
_____ Doctorate
_____ Non-Degree Granting
_____ Public
_____ Private
Other: _____

5. Federal Funds Requested:

1st Year Only _____

2nd Year (If Applicable) _____

3rd Year (If Applicable) _____

Total Amount: _____

6. Duration of Project:

Starting Date

Ending Date

Total No. of Months

7. Proposal Title:

8. Brief Abstract of Proposal: (Do not leave this blank)

9. Legal Applicant
(Name and Complete Mailing Address)

10. Population Directly Benefiting From The Project

Congressional District(s)

11. Certification By Authorizing Official

The applicant certifies to the best of his/her knowledge and belief that the data in this application are true and correct and that the filing of the application has been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant and the applicant will comply with the attached assurances if the assistance is approved.

Name _____ Title _____ Phone _____

Signature _____ Date _____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING TITLE PAGE (FORM ED 0001)

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to vary from 10 to 20 hours per response, with an average of 12 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651; and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1840-0514*, Washington, D.C. 20503. (*OMB Number)

PLEASE NOTE: Complete items 1, 2, and the Congressional District in Item 9 only at the *final* proposal stage. However, *do* complete the rest of Item 9 at the preliminary stage.

ITEM 1. APPLICATION NO.: Enter the Proposal Reference Number assigned to your preliminary proposal.

ITEM 2. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NO.: Enter the unique 9-digit number assigned to your organization for reporting to the Internal Revenue Service. It is also called a Federal identification number, and can be obtained from your budget office. NOTE: No grant can be awarded without an Employer Identification Number. If you do not have one, you should initiate the process to obtain one by calling the Internal Revenue Service.

ITEM 3. PROJECT DIRECTOR: Enter the name and complete mailing address of the designated Project Director. If no one has been selected, so indicate and enter the name of the person who can be contacted to discuss the programmatic aspects of the project. NOTE: Name and address listed here will be used to mail proposal status notifications. Do not forget to include the phone number. Both this address and the Legal Applicant address should be detailed. Remember to complete this section fully.

ITEM 4. INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION: Check the boxes which indicate both type of control and highest degree level granted by the legal applicant.

ITEM 5. FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED: Enter the amount of Federal funds being requested from FIPSE in the first year of the project. If applicable, enter the estimated amount to be requested for a second and/or third year of funding. Under "total" enter the cumulative amount requested for the life of the project.

ITEM 6. DURATION OF PROJECT: Enter beginning date of the project (no earlier than August 1, 1990). Enter the ending date and the total number of months covered.

ITEM 7. PROPOSAL TITLE: Self-explanatory.

ITEM 8. BRIEF ABSTRACT OF PROPOSAL: Complete for both Preliminary and Final Proposals. This should be concise and confined to the space provided, but in no case should you leave this blank. Final proposals: Also see instructions under "submission procedures" requesting a one-page abstract.

ITEM 9. LEGAL APPLICANT: Enter the name and complete mailing address of the institution or agency which will serve as the legal applicant (fiscal agent). When more than one institution or agency is involved, enter the name of the one which will be responsible for budget control. **Acknowledgment of grant awards are sent to this address.** Remember to complete this section fully.

ITEM 10. POPULATION DIRECTLY BENEFITING FROM THE PROJECT: Please be concise, but include both the approximate *number* to be benefited and their general *characteristics* (e.g., "200 older students" "30 junior faculty").

ITEM 11. CERTIFICATION BY AUTHORIZING OFFICIAL: Enter the name, title, and phone number of the official who has the authority both to commit the organization to accept Federal funding and to execute the proposed project. *Submit the original ink-signed copy of the authorizing official's signature.* DO NOT FORGET TO HAVE THIS FORM SIGNED.

BUDGET*

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
BUDGET ITEMS (FIPSE costs only)			
A. Direct Costs:			
1. Salaries & Wages (Professional and Clerical)	$		
2. Employee Benefits			
3. Travel			
4. Equipment (Purchase)			
5. Materials & Supplies			
6. Consultants or Contracts			
7. Other (Equipment Rental, Printing, etc.)			
B. Indirect Costs:			
TOTAL Requested from FIPSE (This Figure Should Appear on the Title Page)	$		
INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT (Project costs not requested from FIPSE)	$		

*Most items will need to be detailed in the Budget Narrative at the Final Proposal stage. This includes a breakdown of the institutional support.

Assurances

The Applicant hereby assures and certifies that it will comply with the regulations, policies, guidelines and requirements, as they relate to the application, acceptance and use of Federal funds for this federally-assisted project. Also the Applicant assures and certifies:

1. It possesses legal authority to apply for the grant; that a resolution, motion or similar action has been duly adopted or passed as an official act of the applicant's governing body, authorizing the filing of the application, including all understandings and assurances contained therein, and directing and authorizing the person identified as the official representative of the applicant to act in connection with the application and to provide such additional information as may be required.

2. It will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) and in accordance with Title VI of the Act, no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the applicant receives Federal financial assistance and will immediately take any measures necessary to effectuate this agreement.

3. It will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d) prohibiting employment discrimination where (1) the primary purpose of a grant is to provide employment or (2) discriminatory employment practices will result in unequal treatment of persons who are or should be benefiting from the grant-aided activity.

4. It will comply with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 794, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicap in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance.

5. It will comply with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq., which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in education programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance.

6. It will comply with the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq., which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance.

7. It will comply with requirements of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provides for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of Federal and Federally-assisted programs.

8. It will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act which limit the political activity of employees.

9. It will comply with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, as they apply to hospital and educational institution employees of State and local governments.

10. It will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that is or gives the appearance of being motivated by a desire for private gain for themselves or others, particularly those with whom they have family, business, or other ties.

11. It will give the sponsoring agency or the Comptroller General through any authorized representative the access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the grant.

12. It will comply with all requirements imposed by the Federal sponsoring agency concerning special requirements of law, program requirements, and other administrative requirements.

13. It will insure that the facilities under its ownership, lease or supervision which shall be utilized in the accomplishment of the project are not listed on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) list of Violating Facilities and that it will notify the Federal grantor agency of the receipt of any communication from the Director of the EPA Office of Federal Activities indicating that a facility to be used in the project is under consideration for listing by the EPA.

14. It will comply with the flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, P.L. 93-234,87 Stat. 975, approved December 31, 1976. Section 102(a) requires, on or after March 2, 1975, the purchase of flood insurance in communities where such insurance is available as a condition for the receipt of any Federal financial assistance for construction or acquisition purposes for use in any area that has been identified by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development as an area having special flood hazards. The phrase "Federal financial assistance" includes any form of loan, grant, guaranty, insurance payment, rebate, subsidy, disaster assistance loan or grant, or any other form of direct or indirect Federal assistance.

15. It will assist the Federal grantor agency in its compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), Executive Order 11593, and the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 469a-1 et seq.) by (a) consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer on the conduct of investigations, as necessary, to identify properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places that are subject to adverse effects (see 36 CFR Part 800.8) by the activity, and notifying the Federal grantor agency of the existence of any such properties, and by (b) complying with all requirements established by the Federal grantor agency to avoid or mitigate adverse effects upon such properties.

Certification Regarding Drug-Free Workplace Requirements
Grantees Other Than Individuals

This certification is required by the regulations implementing the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F. The regulations, published in the January 31, 1989 *Federal Register*, require certification by grantees, prior to award, that they will maintain a drug-free workplace. The certification set out below is a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the agency determines to award the grant. False certification or violation of the certification shall be grounds for suspension of payments, suspension or termination of grants, or governmentwide suspension or debarment (see 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.615 and 85.620).

The grantee certifies that it will provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing a drug-free awareness program to inform employees about—

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;
(2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;
(3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and
(4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will—

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and
(2) Notify the employer of any criminal drug statute conviction for a violation occurring in the workplace no later than five days after such conviction;

(e) Notifying the agency within ten days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted—

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination; or
(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f).

Organization Name | PR/Award Number or Project Name

Name and Title of Authorized Representative

Signature | Date

ED 80-0004

Certification Regarding
Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters
Primary Covered Transactions

This certification is required by the regulations implementing Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, 34 CFR Part 85, Section 85.510, Participants' responsibilities. The regulations were published as Part VII of the May 26, 1988 Federal Register (pages 19160-19211). Copies of the regulations may be obtained by contacting the U.S. Department of Education, Grants and Contracts Service, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 3633 GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, D.C. 20202, telephone (202) 732-2505.

(BEFORE COMPLETING CERTIFICATION, READ INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE)

(1) The prospective primary participant certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief, that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph(1)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State or local) terminated for cause or default.

(2) Where the prospective primary participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

Name And Title Of Authorized Representative

Signature

Date

Instructions for Certification

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective primary participant is providing the certification set out below.

2. The inability of a person to provide the certification required below will not necessarily result in denial of participation in this covered transaction. The prospective participant shall submit an explanation of why it cannot provide the certification set out below. The certification or explanation will be considered in connection with the department or agency's determination whether to enter into this transaction. However, failure of the prospective primary participant to furnish a certification or an explanation shall disqualify such person from participation in this transaction.

3. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when the department or agency determined to enter into this transaction. If it is later determined that the prospective primary participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.

4. The prospective primary participant shall provide immediate written notice to the department or agency to whom this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective primary participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.

5. The terms "covered transaction," "debarred," "suspended," "ineligible," "lower tier covered transaction," "participant," "person," "primary covered transaction," "principal," "proposal," and "voluntarily excluded," as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of the rules implementing Executive Order 12549. You may contact the department or agency to which this proposal is being submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.

6. The prospective primary participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency entering into this transaction.

7. The prospective primary participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion--Lower Tier Covered Transactions," provided by the department or agency entering into this covered transaction, without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.

8. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the Nonprocurement List (Telephone Number).

9. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.

10. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 6 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntary excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.

USE THIS CHECKLIST TO ASSIST YOU IN PREPARING YOUR APPLICATION PACKAGE

Preliminary and Final Proposal

- ☐ Title page has been completed according to the instructions on the back of the sample title page.
- ☐ Title page has been signed and dated by an authorized official and original has been included in package to mail.
- ☐ Each proposal copy has been stapled or otherwise fastened (not in binders or folders) with a title page on top of *each* copy.

Include in Your Proposal Package

Preliminary

- ☐ One (1) original plus two (2) copies. Each of the three copies includes the following:
  - ☐ a title page (with abstract)
  - ☐ a narrative (5 pages maximum)
  - ☐ a budget estimate
- ☐ In addition to the above, 3 extra copies of the title page have been included.
- ☐ Attach the self-addressed acknowledgment postcard to the original.

Final

- ☐ One (1) original plus two (2) copies. Each of the three copies includes the following:
  - ☐ a title page
  - ☐ an abstract (one page maximum)
  - ☐ a narrative (15 to 25 double-spaced pages)
  - ☐ project director's brief resume
  - ☐ budget forms and narrative
- ☐ In addition to the above, 3 extra copies of the title page have been included.

ADDRESS

Remember

Preliminary Proposals must be postmarked or hand delivered (by 4:30 p.m.) no later than **Tuesday, October 17, 1989.**

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM

Comprehensive Program
Attn: 84.116A
U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center,
Room 3633
Washington, D.C. 20202-4725

Remember

Final Proposals must be postmarked or hand delivered (by 4:30 p.m.) no later than **Friday, March 2, 1990.**

Cut Along This Line

Important

Please self-address this postcard and clip to the original copy of the proposal. When you receive the postcard you will know we have received your proposal, and it will also indicate the reference number that has been assigned to your proposal. If you fail to receive the notification of application receipt within six weeks from the date you mailed the application, call (202) 732-2495.

Cut Along This Line

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202-5175

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE $300

U.S. MAIL

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATION
ED 395

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
7th and D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202-5175

Thank your for submitting a proposal. We have received and are now reviewing it. Please save this card and refer to the reference number stamped below in communications about your proposal.

NO: _____

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATION
ED 395

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202-5175

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, $300